

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-20 and 23, which are elected under the requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 121, however, stand objected and/or rejected in the Office Action of August 22, 2007. As set forth above, claims 4, 13-14 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10-12, 16, 18 and 23 have been amended without entering any new matters. Accordingly, elected claims 1-3, 6-12, 16, 18-20 and 23 currently are pending. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Response to the claim rejections:

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert et al (U.S. Patent No. 7123670; hereafter “Gilbert”) in view of Singh et al (U.S. Patent No. 7139320; hereafter “Singh”). Applicants have amended claim 1 and believe the amended claim 1 is patentable over Gilbert in view of Singh because neither Gilbert nor Singh discloses the following limitations: “a pilot subchannel estimator for generating a first frequency response of the first and the second symbols according to the pilot signals of the first and the second symbols transmitted over the first pilot subchannel and a second frequency response of the first and second symbols according to the pilot signals of the first and second symbols transmitted over the second pilot subchannel; and a timing offset estimator, coupled to the pilot subchannel estimator, for calculating a timing offset according to a difference between the first and second frequency response.” Gilbert at most discloses that the frequency offset can also be updated by measuring the difference in the phase of a pilot channel in two data symbols or by measuring the difference in phase between the terminal portion of a data symbol and the data symbol’s cyclic prefix (or guard interval) (Gilbert: Col. 12, lines 22-26), but nowhere teaches or suggests **generating two frequency responses corresponding to different pilot subchannels**

and calculating a timing offset according to a difference between the two frequency responses. Singh does not compensate for the deficiencies of Gilbert. Therefore, the amended claim 1 is patentable over Gilbert in view of Singh. Since claims 2-3 and 6-9 are dependent upon claim 1, if claim 1 is found to be allowable, so too should the dependent
5 claims.

Applicants also assert that claims 10, 18 and 23 are patentable over Gilbert and Singh because of at least the same reasons placing claim 1 allowable. Since claims 11-12, 16, and 19-20 respectively dependent upon claims 10 and 18, if claims 10 and 18 are
10 found to be allowable, so too should the dependent claims.

Conclusion:

In view of the above remarks/arguments and amendments set forth above,
15 Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-3, 6-12, 16, 18-20 and 23. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

20

25

Appl. No. 10/803,047
Amdt. dated November 08, 2007
Reply to Office action of August 22, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 11.08.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)